

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ADOLPH RICHARD	:	CIVIL NO.: 3:20-CV-00051
OTT WRIGHT,	:	
	:	(Chief Magistrate Judge Schwab)
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
LUZERNE COUNTY, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

ORDER

December 18, 2020

The plaintiff, Adolph Richard Ott Wright (“Wright”), filed a multitude of verbose and cryptic motions for our consideration, each of which contains several different sub-motions. *See docs. 8, 9, 10, 13.* Wright’s motions are rambling and contain a great deal of information, the meaning of which we are unable to ascertain. Indeed, it is unclear what relief Wright requests in any of his motions. Wright has also neglected to file a separate brief in support of any of his motions in derogation of Local Rule 7.5. Nevertheless, we briefly address each motion in turn.

Wright filed on June 11, 2020, a two-part motion which seeks to join in this action the president judge of Luzerne County and moves for “AMENDED

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.” *Doc.* 8 at 1, 3 (punctuation and spelling in original). Because Wright has failed to file a supporting brief with his motion in accordance with Local Rule 7.5, **IT IS ORDERED** that Wright’s motion, *doc.* 8, is deemed to be **WITHDRAWN**.

Second, Wright filed on June 18, 2020, another two-part motion to join judges as defendants in this case and to strike an order from a lower Pennsylvania state court. *Doc.* 9. Wright would have this court strike the order from the Court of Common Pleas of Luzerne County which itself struck a judgment which would have awarded Wright \$39,500. *Id.* at 7. This we decline to do—without expounding upon its applicability here, the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine acts to prevent this court from sitting in direct review of state court judgments. *See, e.g., Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp.*, 544 U.S. 280, 284 (2005). Again, because Wright has failed to file a supporting brief with his motion in accordance with Local Rule 7.5, **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Wright’s motion, *doc.* 9, is deemed to be **WITHDRAWN**.

Third, Wright filed on June 24, 2020, a motion to have an Article 3 judge review this case. *Doc.* 10. We write briefly to note that a magistrate judge may address non-dispositive issues by order and dispositive issues by report and recommendation. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636; *see also EEOC v. City of Long Branch*, 866 F.3d 93, 98-102 (explaining magistrate judges regarding dispositive and non-

dispositive motions). Once more, because Wright has failed to file a supporting brief with his motion in accordance with Local Rule 7.5, **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Wright's motion, *doc. 10*, is deemed to be **WITHDRAWN**.

Finally, Wright filed on August 25, 2020, his second motion for a preliminary injunction which contains three additional motions. *Doc. 13*. One last time, because Wright has failed to file a supporting brief with his motion in accordance with Local Rule 7.5, **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Wright's motion, *doc. 13*, is deemed to be **WITHDRAWN**.

Thus, **IT IS ORDERED** that Wright's motions, *docs. 8, 9, 10, 13*, are deemed to be **WITHDRAWN** for failing to comply with Local Rule 7.5.

S/Susan E. Schwab
Susan E. Schwab
United States Chief Magistrate Judge